

From: Ethan Vorhes [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]
Sent: 1/16/2022 8:50:09 PM
To: Todd Prichard [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]; kayla.lyons@dnr.iowa.gov; Noah Poppelreiter [noah.poppelreiter@dnr.iowa.gov]; Mike.anderson@dnr.iowa.gov; Moeller, Mark [DNR] [mark.moeller@dnr.iowa.gov]; Trent Lambert [trent.lambert@dnr.iowa.gov]; Jeremy [DNR] Klatt [jeremy.klatt@dnr.iowa.gov]; Joni K. Ernst [senator@ernst.senate.gov]; Green Jesse [LEGIS] [jesse.green@legis.iowa.gov]; United States Senate [senator@grassley.senate.gov]; Mindrup, Mary [Mindrup.Mary@epa.gov]; Brink, Theresa [Brink.Theresa@epa.gov]; One Production Place [elisa@oneproductionplace.com]; Donnelle Eller [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]; Sen. Kevin Kinney [kevin.kinney@legis.iowa.gov]; claire.celsi@legis.iowa.gov; tom.shiple@legis.iowa.gov; Vilsack, Tom [vilsack.tom@gmail.com]; Claire Hruby [claire.hruby@dnr.iowa.gov]; annette.sweeney@legis.iowa.gov; dawn.driscoll@legis.iowa.gov; sarah.trone.garriott@legis.iowa.gov; ken.rozenboom@legis.iowa.gov; liz.mathis@legis.iowa.gov; Emma Schmit [eschmit@fwwatch.org]; Jessica Mazour [jessica.mazour@sierraclub.org]; Brown, Waylon [LEGIS] [waylon.brown@legis.iowa.gov]; amanda.ragan@legis.state.ia.us; Robert [DNR] Libra [robert.libra@dnr.iowa.gov]; tim.hall@dnr.iowa.gov; Carey Gillam [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]
Subject: Adw
Flag: Follow up

Here is a Dropbox folder with a handful of documents

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/gq4kytpe4mt4ubp/AADSiGKSwtYrwASfJwQmhNeta?dl=0> . I am sending this to you all to start a dialog towards closure. I have tried sending this before to some of you but here goes again. What I compiled is a short concise argument that two drainage wells have been improperly classified and therefore left unchecked to allow significant amounts of pollution. Iowa's definitions of an Ag drainage well was first. Secondly I included the Epa Class Five injection well study Volume 2 which pertains to Adw's Wells and Improved Sinkhole's and was published Sept 30 1999. In the summary on the first page it says "some ADW's are in fact nothing more than Improved sinkholes in areas of karst". In the Introduction on page 4 it says "For example, an improved sinkhole, defined as a surface depression altered to direct fluids into the opening (USEPA 1987) qualifies as a well". It goes on to clarify "If Improved sinkholes or abandon drinking water wells accept surface and/or subsurface drainage from agricultural activities, they qualify as ADW's. To conclude the introduction the further reinforce that these wells in the ditch that received mixed runoff "are ADW's as long as some fraction of the injectate consists of ag drainage. Page six of the document goes on to suggest that these ADW's we general located in poorly drained areas and shallow fractured bedrock situations. On the last page I included of that document it spells out permitting requirements. Iowa 567-51.3 would require this outlet to have been permitted as well as the reclassification to come from the drainage district in a joint application 567-59.4(1)IAC. The necessary information as required to clarify if a permit is required was not filed with the Department ever. On the bottom of that page goes on to say a permit may not be issued if the Adw is in a designated drainage area(an area with a anaerobic lagoon. Which this one is less than 1000' from a mapped sinkhole as well . On page 26 of that same document it reinforces again "some ADW's are simply improved sinkholes where a surface depression has been altered to direct fluids into the opening. From the inspection report the main line was 24" installed in 1915 was a significant diversion. I also attached the final report from the Epa after there spring site visit. In the attachment part 2.2 the Epa recommends registering as an Adw and closure as well as implementing alternative drainage.

Moving on to internal emails and documents from the Dnr to support the facts that the investigations into the alleged improved sinkhole did not qualify were baseless and illegal founded. Epa does spell out the definition of an Improved sinkhole where Iowa does not have a code or any guidance documents. We already know that if they take ag drainage they become....ADW's. It was clear from the beginning to some at the Department that injection large amounts of water was underground injection. Jeremy Klatt describes his first inspection as "I think they may have just (Dug) up the soil until they hit bedrock to create the Adw" He mentions the part about the complaint about the county and Leo, who was never an elected member of any drainage district or the agent registered at the dnr for well 94 or 95. The Dnr has had a hard stance against reviewing this case properly always appealing to the original determination made by Jack Riessen on his site visit. This certainly makes me

shake my head as Jeff Vansteenburgh suggested to Mike Anderson back in 2008. The Mike convinced the Epa to "Take a back seat", and let Iowa handle this. I think it's important to show that when I approached legislators the laughed at me and allowed the pollution to happen instead of actually looking into it. As time proved when I reported the sewers that were already know to exist based on inspections of the district. The county did nothing for a decade and I finally pushed until they were closed with the assistance of the Epa and Dnr. I included the Dnr in 2011 and they accompanied the county, but claim on evidence of wastewater discharge which is the opposite of the county's finding that they did and it was Up to Jeff to follow up. The Dnr emails from Clair Hruby are from the only qualified geologist I know to ever visit the site. Her email says she was struck by how shallow and wide the sinkholes were and there "must be an ag drainage well below the concrete structure at this site". Her detailed site visit assement concludes "a serious attempt to excavate and close the well below this concrete structure should be made. In the letter from Leo Staudt he made it clear that they never visited the site, but stood on the road and talked about it after looking at an Adw on his property, which I never located a single record for. Jack Riessen confirms the site visit inspection of a functioning Ag drainage well on the Staudt property. He also notes no site visit memos were prepared. He also beleives they were closed and not permitted. The Dnr visited the site on review and did view cattle with missing hair. It was clear in the complaint memo the Vorhes's were complaining about water running off the district and animals were coming into contact with the water. Water samples were the only contaminate ever searched for by the Department. They could find any contamination, but failed to test the well injectate. A simple dye trace could tell the department whether or not this injection well contaminates were showing up at the Vorhes wells as well as neighboring properties. Jeremy Klatt's 2008 inspection was as close to an actual investigation of the classification, but relied on finding a letter from Jack to Leo stating it was an Improved sinkhole and not and Adw. He concludes those is not regulated by the Dnr and neither are sinkholes, which is not true either. The department conclude by stating if I had new evidence or wasn't being understood I could meet with them. Which is exactly the problem. I have insisted that a I have clear proof and a actually review of Improved Sinkhole language from the Epa would conclude this to be true as the did conclude. The original record of Drainage district number two which is the outlet in question it mentions excavation. Digging a hole and diverting 24 inches of tile into the aquifer is considered a Adw by Iowa code. A photo of a blowout is the only hole under this structure. The Adw is on the outside and located on the otherside of the cistern from the blowout. This shows there is only one logical conclusion... the old structure was an Adw. The drainage system as described by Jeremy during his site visit was water had blown out sidewalls and created gully. This was from lack of maintenance. This created backpressue and unnatural drainage where water pushes up through the soil profile and can lift recently sprayed chemicals off the soil. We beleive these early spring runoff is where the chemical buildup occurs creating the reaction our animals and the wildlife (Whitetails) experience. The problem with addressing the situation with landowners is another in itself. The county while being quite involved after a records reveiw has always denied involvement to outsiders. Inspection reports list the county on papers and phone numbers. The well has been polluted without doubt following a Jul 99 manure spill during a time when it should have been required to close. These wells have had sewers dumping into them for decades and when pressed the county and department allowed it to continue for another twenty years. One well was indicated as closed and 5 years after the work order was drafted the job canceled. The DNR's handling of Ag drainage wells is questionable at best, and there handling of this situation is a disgrace. The know pollution of surface water running into an open well with a defunct cistern and a open lagoon Cafo immediately above it in the drainage basin and know septic systems and the Department is all nothing further needed... If no action happens I will be spreading these documents all over social media and other news outlets. I am tired of flat out denial of the ongoing cover-up of this situation. Again let the records reflect Leo Staudt was not an elected bonded member of the district asking for a reclassification. This district has a long history of not following the laws as the records in Charles City will prove. The Dnr does not have a inspection memo where it shows this well injects anything other than Ag drainage and storm runoff. The cafo makes it unpermittable and it should have been closed in 1999 before the manure spill. The department should be ordered to close it. The well was dug and enlarged thus should have been permitted by Dnr and considered an Adw. I have plenty of supporting documentation and more on the way from Idals, Nracs, and Epa. If there is any dispute as to validate call me [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] Thanks Ethan Vorhes.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android